

REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed April 5, 2005. Claims 1-35 were rejected. Claims 6, 8, 10, 23, and 29 were objected to. Claims 1, 6, 8-17, 23, 24, 29, and 31-35 have been amended. Claims 1-35 remain pending in the application.

Objections to the Claims

The Office Action objected to claims 6, 8, 10, 23, and 29 due to various informalities. Applicant has amended the claims to correct the informalities. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objections to claims 6, 8, 10, 23, and 29.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 1-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Anderson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,209,095), hereinafter “Anderson.” Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections in light of the following remarks.

Anticipation under §102(e) requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claims. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). As discussed below, Anderson fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 8-17, 24, and 31-35. Support for the amendments may be found at paragraphs 0162 and 0169 and in original claim 2, among other locations. Claim 1 (as amended) recites, in pertinent part (emphasis added):

A method for forming and verifying a service message for a multi-service environment, said method comprising:

digitally signing one or more message components for a first part of a service message;

digitally signing one or more message components for a second part of said service message;

forming said service message from said first and second parts, and first and second digital signatures of said first and second parts;

receiving said service message at a server;

partitioning said service message at said server into a first partition and a second partition, wherein said first partition comprises said first part of said service message and said first digital signature, and wherein said second partition comprises said second part of said service message and said second digital signature;

sending said first partition from said server to a first service in said multi-service environment;

verifying said first part of said service message at said first service using said first digital signature;

sending said second partition from said server to a second service in said multi-service environment; and

verifying said second part of said service message at said second service using said second digital signature.

In regard to claim 1 (as amended), Applicant respectfully submits that Anderson does not teach or suggest “partitioning said service message at said server into a first partition and a second partition,” “sending said first partition from said server to a first service,” or “sending said second partition from said server to a second service.” For similar reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Anderson does not teach or suggest independent claims 8-11, 13, 15, 17, 24, 31, 33, and 35.

In regard to claim 2, Applicant respectfully submits that Anderson does not teach or suggest “wherein at least one message component is common to both said first and second parts of said service message.” The Office Action noted that Fig. 6 of Anderson shows a value labeled “AMOUNT” in both the electronic check 110 and the deposit instrument 160. However, the figure and description indicate that the two amounts are different components. In the electronic check 110, the value is “the sum of money to be paid 120” (col. 26, lines 1-2). In the deposit instrument 160, the value is “the sum of money to be deposited” (col. 29, lines 30-31). Anderson’s labeling of the two values

with different reference numerals (“AMOUNT 120” and “AMOUNT 166”) further indicates that these are not “one message component” as recited in claim 2. For similar reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Anderson does not teach or suggest claims 5, 12, 14, 16, 21, 25, 28, 32, and 34.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8-17, 24, and 31-35 are patentably distinct from Anderson. The remaining dependent claims provide additional limitations to the independent claims. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 1-35 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §102(e) rejections.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If a phone interview would speed allowance of any pending claims, such is requested at the Examiner's convenience.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5181-77401/BNK.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

- Return Receipt Postcard

Respectfully submitted,



B. Noël Kivlin
Reg. No. 33,929
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8840
Date: 5-10-05